REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated May 13, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 13, 2005. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 remain pending following entry of this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 12, 14-15, 20, 25-26, 28, 32-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yen* et al. (US Publication 2002/0054141, hereinafter "*Yen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding claims 1, 14, 25, and 34, Applicants submit that *Yen* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in these claims. For example, *Yen* fails to teach or suggest a controlling browser window that controls at least one of a graphical aspect of the opened controlled browser window and a functional aspect of the opened controlled browser window.

In rejecting claims 1, 14, 25 and 34, the Examiner cites to portions of *Yen* that describe an application that includes a plurality of display windows, positioned adjacent to one another in a particular way. For example, *Yen*, Figures 1-3 illustrate the organization of a plurality of display windows associated with the application. The

Page 9

374136_1

material cited by the Examiner is related to the display and organization of these windows:

> The application displays a first main window display 46 at a first predetermined location on a display screen. 24 and a second main window display 48 at a second predetermined location on the display screen 24. The second predetermined location corresponds to the first predetermined location and the second main window display 48 are enabled to link adjacently to the first main window display 46.

Yen, ¶ 47. This material teaches that a group of windows may be organized in such a manner so as to be displayed adjacent to one another. This concept is further fleshed out in the material cited by the Examiner:

> In the FIG. 6b, the second main window display 48 and the first sub-window display 52 are subordinate to the first main window display 46. Therefore, when first main window display 46 shifts, the second main window display 48 and the first sub-window display 52 also shift correspondingly so as to enable the first main window display 46, the first sub-window display 52 and the second main window display 48 remaining adjacently linking together. When a user closes the first main window display by selecting close the function button 54, the operation also causes the second main window display 48 and the first sub-window display 52 to close.

Yen, ¶ 52. The material cited by the Examiner discloses a linking between window displays that is used to coordinate the visual representation and placement of the window displays. As disclosed in *Yen,* doing so allows for the seamless presentation of the windows of an application to display stock quotes and to coordinate stock purchases. None of this material, however, teaches or suggests a hidden browser window that controls the visual or functional operations of a controlled browser window.

The present claims are directed to controlling a first browser window (the controlled browser window) from a second browser window (the controlling browser window). In a specific embodiment, Applicants claim opening a controlling browser window configured to control aspects of a controlled browser window that include both the functional aspects and visual aspects of the controlled browser window. For example, at paragraph 31, the specification describes how the controlling window may operate to control the functional aspects of the controlled window:

Page 10

374136_1

the control window may restrict a user's ability to configure the graphical user interface of the browser program 240, change the appearance of the graphical user interface, prevent access to one or more network addresses, lock one or more keyboard buttons, lock one or more mouse buttons, etc.

Specification, ¶ 31. Accordingly, because *Yen* fails to disclose at least one of a graphical aspect of the opened controlled browser window and a functional aspect of the opened controlled browser window in the manner claimed, Applicants submit that claims 1, 14, 25 and 34 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 9-11, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by *Yen,* as applied to claims 1, 14, 25 and 34 above, and *Netscape® Communicator 4.75,* copyright 2000 (hereinafter "*Netscape*"). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Each of these rejected claims depends from one of independent claims 1, 14, and 25. As set forth above, *Yen* fails to disclose a hidden browser window that controls the visual or functional operations of a controlled browser window. Further, the Examiner concedes that *Yen* fails to teach "aspects of the controlled browser window to be controlled by the controlling browser window [that] comprise at least one browser chrome element displayed by a graphical user interface displayed by the opened controlled browser window." *See Final Office Action,* p. 6. The Examiner asserts that *Yen,* in view of *Netscape* teaches or suggests this limitation.

Respectfully, *Netscape* does not teach or suggest a controlling at least one browser chrome element displayed by a graphical user interface displayed by the opened controlled browser window. In rejecting claims these claims, the Examiner cites to screenshots taken of the *Netscape* program being used to display a web-page, and then selecting a link on the displayed webpage to open a second browser window. In particular, the link to the second browser window is activated using a context sensitive menu choice "Open Link in New Window." However, once the second window is opened, (screenshot 3 of the *Netscape* program) the original browser window

Page 11

374136_1

(screenshot 2 of the *Netscape* program) fails to exert any control or influence over the second browser window. A user is free to engage in any action provided by the *Netscape* program, without any restriction or control effectuated by the first browser window. Further, in processing the "open link in new window" menu selection, the first browser window (screenshot 2) fails to exert any control over the visual appearance or functionality of the second browser window (screenshot 3).

The Examiner argues that the controlled browser window (presumably, the window of figure 2) is "controlling at least one browser chrome element by deactivating the display of a portion of the chrome, i.e., some of the navigation buttons such as the "back" and "forward" buttons." *See Office Action*, p 7. Respectfully, this argument grossly mischaracterizes the teachings of the reference. In this example, the "back" and "forward" buttons in screenshots 3 are not deactivated, and nor has the functional operations of these buttons modified in any way, by a controlling browser window, or otherwise; rather, the buttons appear "grayed out" because there are *no* "forward" or "back" browsed pages to access. As described above, the second browser window, once opened, is free to execute independently from any actions of the first browser window. Thus, the combination of *Yen* and *Netscape* fail to teach or suggest controlling operational aspects that includes at least one browser chrome element displayed by a graphical user. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 3, 9-11, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31 and 35 are allowable, and respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claims 8, 13, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yen*, as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above, and *Hodgkinson* (U.S. Publication 2002/0016802). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of these rejected claims depends from one of independent claims 1, 14, and 25. As set forth above, *Yen* fails to teach or suggest a controlling browser window that controls at least one of a graphical aspect of the opened controlled browser window and a functional aspect of the opened controlled browser window.

374136_1

Regarding claims 8, 13, 18, and 27 the Examiner concedes that *Yen* fails to teach or suggest receiving user input to which the controlled browser program is configured to produce a response in a predetermined manner; and executing the controlling browser program to prevent the response in the predetermined manner and cause a response different from the predetermined manner. The Examiner asserts that *Hodgkinson* supplies this missing limitation.

Hodgkinson, however, teaches a method that provides a "management system for the operation of an on-screen page display generated from a user selected internet site." *Hodgkinson* ¶ 15. The method allows the display of web pages on a device limited in terms of available processor power and/or display possibilities with respect to the PC. *Hodgkinson*, ¶ 23. As web pages are displayed, oftentimes, web-browsers must reformat information already rendered for display. For example, if a graphic image does not indicate a size, the browser will use a default size until the actual size is known. Once known, the page has to be reformatted according to the actual size. On a device with a slow processor, this reformatting may cause the screen to flicker. *Hodgkinson*, ¶ 26. Or on a display screen of a limited size, this process may cause a radical jumping or jittering appearance. Using the techniques disclosed by *Hodgkinson*, this effect is ameliorated by delaying rendering of data so that the page does not have to be reformatted. Otherwise, the display of HTML web-pages operates exactly as normal. In other words, the browser window continues to produce responses to user input in the predetermined manner. Applicants however, claim a method that includes an element to prevent the response in the predetermined manner and cause a response different from the predetermined one. Accordingly, applicants submit that *Yen* in view of *Hodgkinson* fails to disclose Applicants' invention in the manner claimed. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 8, 13, 18 and 27 and 35 are allowable, and respectfully request, that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

374136_1

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

Page 14

374136_1